

April 24, 2006  
Case No.: NL 020328 (7790/442)  
Serial No.: 10/510,471  
Filed: October 6, 2004  
Page 5 of 8

— REMARKS —

Claims 1-5. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Lee rejected pending claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

- A. Examiner Lee rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,435,704 B1 to *Monter et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Lee's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1 and 2 over the *Monter*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read the *Monter*. To warrant this §102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 2 *Monter* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 1 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 1. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(e) rejection of independent claim 1, because, among other things, *Monter* fails to teach or suggest "a cup-shaped axially positioned cap serving as an optical screening means that partly surrounds the light source for intercepting unreflected light rays, characterized in that the cap is surrounded at a distance d by a screening ring which extends over a height h in the direction of the light emission window" in as complete detail as recited in independent claim 1.

Specifically, as shown in FIGS. 13-15, *Monter* teaches a cup-shaped axially positioned cap 400 serving as an optical screening means that partly surrounds a light source 150 for intercepting unreflected light rays from light source 150. *Monter* further teaches cap 400 having side walls 420, 426 and 427. See, *Monter* at column 8, lines 45-51. The Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that side walls 420, 426 and 427 can not be interpreted as a "screening ring" surrounding cap 400 when in fact side walls 420, 426 and 427 are walls of cap 400. Thus,

April 24, 2006  
Case No.: NL 020328 (7790/442)  
Serial No.: 10/510,471  
Filed: October 6, 2004  
Page 6 of 8

*Montet* fails to teach or suggest a "screening ring" as required by independent claim 1, particularly a screening ring for intercepting unreflected light rays from light source 150 that is not intercepted by the side walls 420, 426 and 427 of cap 400.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Montet* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 2 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Montet* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable *Montet*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Montet* is therefore respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Rosenbaum rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,435,704 B1 to *Montet* in view of EP 0336478 to *Massen* et al.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 4 and 5 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 4 and 5 are allowable over *Montet* in view of *Massen* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over the *Montet*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Montet* in view of *Massen* is therefore respectfully requested.

April 24, 2006  
Case No.: NL 020328 (7790/442)  
Serial No.: 10/510,471  
Filed: October 6, 2004  
Page 7 of 8

**Claims 6-15.** The Applicant asserts that art of record, particularly Montet and Massen, fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination "a cup-shaped axially positioned cap serving as an optical screening means that partly surrounds the light source for intercepting a first portion of unreflected light rays from the light source, characterized in that the cap is surrounded by a screening ring for intercepting a second portion of unreflected light rays from the light source" as recited in independent claim 6, and "a cup-shaped axially positioned cap serving as an optical screening means that partly surrounds the light source for intercepting unreflected light rays from the light source, characterized in that the cap is surrounded by a screening ring forming part of a conical surface" as recited in independent claim 11.

An allowance of claims 6-15 is therefore respectfully requested.

April 24, 2006  
Case No.: NL 020328 (7790/442)  
Serial No.: 10/510,471  
Filed: October 6, 2004  
Page 8 of 8

**SUMMARY**

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Lee is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: April 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
DENIS JOSEPH CAREL VAN OERS

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Frank Keegan  
Registration No. 50,145  
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

  
Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant